

JUL 31 2006

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

LOURDES ALATORRE ARRANGA; et
al.,

Petitioners,

v.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 05-74657

Agency Nos. A96-053-987
A96-053-988
A96-053-989

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted July 24, 2006**

Before: ALARCÓN, HAWKINS, and THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Lourdes Alatorre Arranga, Jose Ibarra Santos, and Luis Angel Ibarra

Alatorre, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition pro se for review of the Board of

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Immigration Appeals’ (“Board”) dismissal of their appeal of an immigration judge’s denial of their applications for cancellation of removal. We lack jurisdiction to review the Board’s discretionary determination that petitioners failed to establish exceptional and extremely unusual hardship, *see Romero-Torres v. Ashcroft*, 327 F.3d 887, 890 (9th Cir. 2003), as well as their non-colorable claim that the agency failed to adequately consider the factors in their case, *see Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 930 (9th Cir. 2005) (“[t]raditional abuse of discretion challenges recast as alleged due process violations do not constitute colorable constitutional claims that would invoke our jurisdiction.”).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.